

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and the rejection of claims 1-9 and 12-21 is respectfully requested. Applicant has attempted to address every ground for rejection in the final Office Action dated October 25, 2004 (Paper No. 20040708) and believes this application is now in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant acknowledges the allowability of claims 3, 12, 18 and 21 if rewritten to overcome the informalities.

Claims 1-9 and 12-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims to correct the informalities, and respectfully submits that the §112 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-9, 14-15, 17, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 579,525 in view of Kuhl, U.S. Patent No. 6,183,047. Applicant traverses the rejection because neither reference discloses or suggests a “rim being pivoted around an axis by a predefined angular range”, as required by independent claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness because no reference has been cited for this feature. In the ‘525 reference, the rim is not pivoted around an axis by a predefined angular range, but is static. Instead, as seen in Figures 7a and 7b, the first machining means 32 and the second machining means 30 move with respect to the rim as indicated by the arrows. The Kuhl reference is merely cited for teaching the use of a machining process to remove welds on bicycle rims. Neither reference

discloses or suggests a “rim being pivoted around an axis by a predefined angular range”, as required by independent claim 1.

In contrast, the rim 1 of the present invention is continuously pivoted on an axis 6 within a predefined angular range. In this configuration, the rim well 4 is worked on with the width of the milling cutter head 26 and an angular range is traversed on the rim 1. Another advantage of this configuration is, even when a small diameter end milling cutter is used, the entire welding burr can be reliably removed over its entire width. Further, this configuration enables a smooth and continuous transition between worked and unworked portions so that there are no sharp edges formed as a result of using the end milling cutter. Further still, in the present invention, there are less moving parts and the overall process is more stabile. In view of the foregoing, Applicant requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 and 11-20 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable over the references of record for the same reasons set forth with respect to their parent claim since each sets forth additional structural elements and novel steps of Applicant’s invention.

Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. In the alternative, the claims are submitted to be in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner discover there are remaining issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, she is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Laura R. Wanek
Registration No. 53,737

January 21, 2005
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\2322\680941783985.DOC